

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Bost (to rank immediately after Mr. Bacon).

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Fleischmann (to rank immediately after Mr. Obernolte), Mr. Zinke (to rank immediately after Ms. Tenney).

Ms. STEFANIK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCE EXACERBATED INFLATION NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE NATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 347.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 166 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 347.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1725

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of

the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, or REIN IN Act.

This legislation is timely and clearly needed. Sky-high inflation started sweeping across the Nation soon after the Biden administration came into power.

Pushing one big-spending policy after another, President Biden has continued to throw fuel on the inflationary fire. That fire is rapidly consuming the wages of our constituents. They have had to pay higher and higher prices for everything from eggs to electricity, all while inflation pushes their real wages further and further behind.

President Biden just does not seem to get it or admit it. At first, he and his administration ignored warnings his policies would spark inflation. Then, they tried to spin the tale that inflation was only temporary. Then, when it became obvious to everyone that was not the case, they attempted to claim that a monthly decrease in the rate of how fast inflation was rising meant inflation was actually falling, but anyone could see that made no sense.

It is long past time the President learned and admitted more about how his actions have led to this harmful inflation. That is why we need this bill.

The REIN IN Act ensures that costly actions the President decides to take solely under his own authority through executive orders will not go into effect until he is informed of and considers the potential inflationary effects.

How does the bill require that? Simple. It requires the President to receive and consider inflation estimates from the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers for each executive order that is projected to cause an annual gross budgetary effect of at least \$1 billion.

The hope is the President, once he is informed of and understands the potential for inflationary harm from his own policy initiatives, will think twice about inflicting such harm. Here is hoping he does.

In addition, the bill requires regular reports to Congress on these new inflation estimates that are prepared for and considered by the President. That way, if the President ignores the dangers and marches ahead with an inflation-inducing policy, Congress will be better equipped to take timely action to rein in an irresponsible use of Presidential power.

That is our constitutional role in the legislative branch, which the REIN IN Act recognizes. This powerful legisla-

tive medicine will, I hope, lead the President to stop his inflationary onslaught on our economy.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, St. Louis, House Democrats, and I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

While Democrats passed numerous laws last Congress that are successfully reducing inflation every month, House Republicans have come up with nothing more than a study in response. This is unbelievable.

The substance and process of this bill amount to nothing more than political theater to distract from and undermine the immense successes of congressional Democrats and the Biden administration.

□ 1730

If Republicans were serious about fighting inflation and cutting costs for regular, everyday people, they would have joined with Democrats to pass critical legislation like the Inflation Reduction Act to rebuild American manufacturing and lower the cost of prescription drugs, healthcare, energy, and other goods and services for the people of our country rather than pushing an extreme MAGA messaging bill that accomplishes nothing. Nothing. Not a thing.

The global spike in inflation has been caused by food and fuel disruptions resulting from the illegal and unprovoked Russian invasion of Ukraine, as well as auto part supply shortages connected to the COVID-19 pandemic. There is no evidence that government spending or executive orders by President Biden have increased inflation.

The President and congressional Democrats have taken steps to enact policies; not studies, not reports, but actual, tangible policies and dollars delivered to our communities to lower costs for regular, everyday people. Yet, we understand that still much more work remains.

For over 20 years, while I was a single mother of 2, I experienced countless times what it was like to see costs rise faster than my wages. I know what it is like to have to choose between paying the electric bill or paying rent.

I remember thinking to myself, who is it that is fighting for me and for other people in my situation?

Lawmakers in Congress can help alleviate that pain. Lawmakers in Congress can prioritize enacting policies to raise wages and lower costs, and that is what congressional Democrats have done.

For so many people in my community of St. Louis and around the country, skyrocketing rents and high utility costs are consistent barriers to

keeping families safe and fed, and that is a moral and policy failure.

We have seen how people's lives improved when the Federal Government stepped up to enact a moratorium on evictions or sent urgently needed stimulus checks to families or expanded the child tax credit or capped insulin at \$35 a month.

Those are the actions that saved lives. That is what we need, and we need more of that now. Yet, here we have a report.

However, what my House Republican colleagues have demonstrated this Congress and what they are demonstrating here today with this bill is that they are not serious about governing. They have circumvented regular order to bring this hollow bill to a vote on the House floor. Even as people continue to suffer the consequences of inflation and flawed responses that exacerbate unemployment, corporations, especially in the energy industry, have capitalized on this crisis to raise prices for everyday people and for families.

Last year, Exxon made \$56 billion in profits, using inflation as a cover to fleece regular, everyday people just trying to get to medical appointments or to school.

I oppose this bill because I am aware of what it is. It is a distraction from our work for our constituents. It is a waste of government resources, and it is a squandering of time that we should be using to rein in corporate greed and support those of our neighbors who need our help the most. I oppose this bill because it isn't a meaningful way to legislate. It is a political stunt.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my REIN IN Act.

During the past 2 years of one party, far-left, radical, socialist Democrat rule in Washington led by President Joe Biden, inflation has skyrocketed to the highest level in my lifetime. You talk to any family, any small business, any farmer, any manufacturer, and they will say that the inflation that they are suffering from is crippling their businesses, crippling their family budgets.

It is a painful tax on every American and Bidenflation continues to be the number one concern I hear today across my district in upstate New York in the North Country.

In House Republicans' "Commitment to America," our new House majority, the people's House majority, promised to deliver and support policies to ensure our economy is strong.

In fact, one of the main reasons we have this Republican House majority is because the American people are smart. They know that the historic inflation, the highest rate of inflation in my lifetime, is a direct result of Joe

Biden's executive orders and the trillions and trillions of reckless and wasteful spending from single-party Democrat rule.

In fact, in Joe Biden's first year in office, he issued more executive orders than any President in my lifetime. This reckless, far-left agenda cost hardworking families more than \$1 trillion in taxpayer dollars and even more in the added cost of inflation. Whether it was canceling the Keystone XL pipeline on his first day in office to pushing his out-of-touch and costly Green New Deal regulations, Joe Biden has fueled this inflation crisis and caused this inflation crisis working with the previous radical, socialist Democrat majority.

By passing the REIN IN Act, House Republicans will demand transparency for the American people by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing hardworking families and the painful impact that has on inflation.

What are the Democrats so afraid of?

This is about transparency for the American people, and it is long past time for Joe Biden to take into account this harmful impact of his failed, far-left agenda.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Today, House Republicans are laser-focused on fulfilling our commitment to America by reigning in historic inflation, historic Bidenflation, on behalf of hardworking American families and small businesses, not just in my district, but across this great Nation.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the great Representative from St. Louis, Ms. BUSH, for yielding time.

Madam Chair, I rise today to speak against H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act, and I will start my remarks today by saying how ironic it is that Republicans spent the entire first week of this session entangled in a fight in order for them to get the votes to secure a Speaker of the House, and the whole crux of that entanglement was rules to maintain regular order in the House.

Just as we go back to Schoolhouse Rock, Republicans introduce a bill and it is supposed to go to committee, get a markup in that committee, a hearing in that committee, and a vote in that committee. If that bill can survive a committee vote, it comes right here to the floor of this House.

We spent a whole week tied up in the beginning of this term trying to reassert that order. And then, today, one of the first acts that we have from this Committee on Oversight and Reform is to subvert that because perhaps they knew that this would not survive their own committee. So it goes straight to the floor for a vote, subverting all of

those arguments that Republicans were making about restoring order to this House.

But let's get into the substance of this bill. Ironically, if they had gone through regular order, they may have caught that this bill does nothing to rein in inflation, in part, because in their haste to put it together, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle committed an incredibly basic drafting error that makes this bill completely unenforceable.

Even if we agreed on their ends, the haste and the rush to put this together and skip committee has created a drafting error that doesn't even make this bill enforceable. But even putting that error aside, my colleagues and I seem to have wildly different definitions of what actually is considered inflationary.

While Republicans have labeled virtually any Federal spending during the pandemic as inflationary—while railing against the child tax credit that helped babies continue to be fed and diapers on their bottoms, that helped families stitch things together, while they railed against the eviction moratoriums and the Paycheck Protection Act—Moody's Analytics found that the American Rescue Plan prevented this country from slipping into a double-digit recession.

Because of the American Rescue Plan and the actual Inflation Reduction Act that Democrats passed last year, our country's inflation rate is now lower than in the U.K., Canada, and 20 other European Union member states.

Yet Republicans have introduced legislation to repeal the Inflation Reduction Act, which would immediately raise the price of insulin along with other critical prescription drugs.

Tell me how that is fighting inflation when they are proposing to raise the cost of prescriptions.

Not only did Republicans vote to raise prices on prescription drugs, but they also voted against measures to drive down the price of gasoline last year.

Last year, Democrats presented a bill to penalize companies who were price gouging during the middle of Putin's war on Ukraine. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against that, too.

So which one is it?

Republicans have controlled this body for almost 2 months and have not passed a single bill that would actually address inflation or cut costs for working families.

But you know what Democrats did?

In January, we capped the price of insulin at \$35 so that everyday working families can actually get a little bit more ahead. And we have a lot more to go.

But we don't even see a carefulness and a thoughtfulness from the other side of the aisle to even draft the language in this bill properly. It is not even ready for a vote, so why should we.

Madam Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this so-called REIN IN Act.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act.

I do think that it is very rich that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about regular order all of a sudden. My first 2 years in Congress there was no such thing as regular order. In fact, I served on the Budget Committee and they passed two budget reconciliations on the House floor without it going through committee: completely bypassed committee.

First one was \$1.9 trillion. The next one, \$700 billion. Really all it was, was the Green New Deal: just real quick, hurry up, get it to the floor. We have to spend trillions and trillions of dollars and hurt as many Americans as possible in the 2 years that we have left in power.

With this REIN IN Act, this bill will hold Joe Biden accountable for this reckless spending that he has approved by my Democrat colleagues, who hastily sent all of these bills to him, rushing him to spend trillions and trillions of American taxpayer dollars.

His administration will now be required to publish the inflationary impact of executive orders before enacting them.

Madam Chair, my constituents are struggling to deal with the disastrous effects of Bidenflation. Under 2 years of a one-party rule, Joe Biden and NANCY PELOSI unleashed a record inflation crisis on the American people that has decimated their bank and retirement accounts, increased gas prices to record levels, raised utility bills, drove up grocery costs, and made it harder to live for the people in my district, Colorado's Third District, and all throughout this great country.

The primary root cause of this record-breaking inflation was trillions of dollars of wasteful Federal spending.

In Joe Biden's first year in office alone, he issued more executive orders than any other President in my lifetime, costing taxpayers more than \$1 trillion.

The American people said loud and clear last November that enough is enough. They have empowered this new majority to demand transparency by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing American families and small businesses.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and chairwoman of the Republican Conference, ELISE STEFANIK, for her work to hold Joe Biden and his administration accountable.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

□ 1745

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mary-

land (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee for her leadership on refuting this legislation.

After 2 years of rooting for economic failure and blaming President Biden for everything; for post-COVID global inflation, for the instability caused by supply chain breakdowns, and the phenomenal failure of Donald Trump's mismanagement of the coronavirus pandemic, after all that, after all the whining and crying about inflation, Republicans finally have the chance to take center stage, right now, with their proposed solution to the problem of inflation.

The world has been waiting with bated breath. Would it be what Richard Nixon did, wage and price controls? Would it be what Herbert Hoover, that Republican did, total laissez-faire, whatever happens, happens?

Well, the long wait is over. The GOP has now debuted their big plan for dealing with inflation in America with H.R. 347, something called the REIN IN Act, which stands for the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

It is a bill for a mandatory reporting requirement related to executive orders that might apply to two or three executive orders a year.

You got that right: A reporting requirement related to a handful of executive orders every year is the GOP's response to inflation after barnstorming the entire country, claiming that they had some kind of solution.

Now, you might think it is the most brilliant thing since the invention of Social Security, which they opposed, or Medicare, which they opposed, or you might think it is the dumbest thing since Donald Trump's last trillion-dollar corporate tax giveaway.

But either way, it will have zero effect on inflation or deflation in the United States of America. Nothing. It is not going to have any effect at all.

Now, our friends in the GOP are interested in this session of Congress in tortured, inscrutable, incomprehensible acronyms.

So they can have the REIN IN Act, which they seem very connected to, but I want to suggest a better title that will still conform to their acronym. Let's call it the running on empty initiative based on no ideas none act. How about that?

The legislation was hatched without any hearing, and it shows. It has no legislative meaning and no potential economic consequences.

Even as reporting bills go, it is pathetically weak, as it doesn't even require publication of the report. They came up with a reporting requirement that didn't even require the report to be published.

Look, executive orders are not the cause of inflation, and there is no economic research suggesting they are.

The most conservative economists in the world will tell you that inflation is

a complex, global phenomenon connected to prices, supply chains, supply and demand curves, and unemployment rate.

Since 2020, inflation has risen worldwide, exacerbated by supply chain delays caused by the pandemic and then Vladimir Putin's filthy war of aggression in Ukraine, which some of our friends over there support.

President Biden has created something like an economic miracle out of the chaos handed to him by Donald Trump.

After signing his massive tax giveaway, Trump's failed State dysfunctional response to COVID plunged America into its most severe economic contraction since 1946. Someone dispute that.

The unemployment rate rose to 14.8 percent under Donald Trump, the highest on record since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began collecting data in 1948.

In 2021, Biden and the Democrats got to work. We passed the American Rescue Plan, which fueled a strong, equitable, economic recovery with historic reductions in unemployment, in poverty, in economic hardship.

Real GDP increased by 5.7 percent. The unemployment rate decreased to 4 percent, surpassing all forecasts. Wages increased by 5 percent with the highest increases going to lower economic income earners.

So Democratic policies have allowed the U.S. to absorb the shock of rising inflation engulfing the globe since 2020.

That is serious economic policy, what President Biden and the Democrats are engaged in, and they have a silly little symbolic messaging bill for a couple of notations they didn't even want to publish originally within the process of offering executive orders.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, we have created 12 million new jobs in America. How many million jobs do they want to erase over there in their desperate, sudden pursuit of inflation?

They raised the debt limit three times under Donald Trump. Now they talk about the debt limit all the time. They raised it three times, and they contributed under Donald Trump 25 percent of all the debt in the United States from George Washington to Joe Biden—25 percent of the debt under one President, Donald Trump.

They did that, and now they dare come talk to us about inflation, and the bill that they advance is one to have some people pass some more paperwork around.

Come on. Give me a break. Give us something better than the running on empty initiative with no new ideas at all.

We recommend a “no” vote. What real economic action requires is precisely what President Biden is already doing.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, over the past 2 years, through the Inflation Reduction Act, the American Rescue Plan, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, and other successes, Democrats and President Biden have made historic investments in public transit, renewable energy, healthcare, and economic stability.

We have created jobs. We have advanced justice. We have advanced equity. We have reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and we have slowed down inflation.

We put hundreds of dollars in people's pockets. We capped the price of insulin. We invested in people.

As a result, when adjusted for inflation, wages have risen for so many families over the last 7 months, and unemployment remains at its lowest level since 1969.

However, we need to do so much more. Many of our neighbors, particularly those with the greatest need, are suffering from the consequences of high costs across the board.

I am glad House Democrats controlled the House during the pandemic. This bill makes a mockery of people living in poverty who need meaningful relief.

The Republicans' big idea, the big plan that we have been told about and waiting on is to write a flawed bill that mandates—guess what—more paperwork. Give me a break, as my ranking member just said.

I know what it is like to be at risk of eviction. I know what it is like to be hungry. I know what it is like to be cold, so cold that you don't know if you will survive the nights.

Never one time when I was living out of my car with my two babies did I ask for a report from Congress for help. I needed diapers. I needed food. You can't eat a report.

If this bill was to move forward, no one will be saying, I am so glad I used this report to pay the rent. Let me take shelter with this report because Congress did their job.

Let's take real care, real actual care of the people. I oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This legislation asks every Member to answer two simple questions.

First, do you want the President to know what the inflationary dangers are before he takes executive actions?

Second, when the President knows about the economic dangers of a policy and inflicts them on our constituents anyway, do you want to be better informed so that Congress can take the necessary action to rein in the executive branch?

The answers to both of those questions ought to be yes. This bill makes sure both the President and the Con-

gress have the necessary information so we can discharge our duties more efficiently and responsibly.

Our constituents back home, who have been suffering from the inflationary effects of Washington's poorly thought-out policies, deserve nothing less.

I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act".

SEC. 2. EXECUTIVE ORDER MANDATED INFLATION ACCOUNTABILITY AND REFORM.

(a) MANDATORY INFLATION FORECASTING.—For any major Executive order, the President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, shall prepare and consider a statement estimating the inflationary effects of the Executive order, including whether the Executive order is determined to have no significant impact on inflation, is determined to have quantifiable inflationary impact on the consumer price index, or is determined likely to have a significant impact on inflation but the amount cannot be determined at the time the estimate is prepared.

(b) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—The head of each agency shall provide to the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, such information and assistance as the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, may reasonably request to assist the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, in carrying out this section.

(c) REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing each statement prepared and considered under subsection (a) during the year.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) MAJOR EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term "major Executive order" means any Executive order that would be projected (in a conventional cost estimate) to cause an annual gross budgetary effect of at least \$1,000,000,000, but does not include any such measure that—

(A) provides for emergency assistance or relief at the request of any State or local government or any official of a State or local government; or

(B) is necessary for the national security or the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those

printed in House report 118-4. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the period insert the following: "To the greatest extent practicable, any estimate of the inflationary impact of any major Executive order under this section shall take into account the spending patterns of military personnel and of residents of non-metropolitan areas, including rural areas and farm households."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bost) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Consumer Price Index is defined as "the average change over time in the prices paid by urban customers."

Now, let me say that again: Urban customers. What about the 46 million Americans who live in rural areas or the 2.6 million workers that are working on a farm or the 1.3 million in the military? They are crushed by inflation, as well.

Illinois' 12th District is one of the largest agricultural districts in the region. It is also home of Scott Air Force Base. But all too often, these hard-working, God-fearing patriots are ignored by the D.C. swamp.

The President can't ignore their needs simply because they don't live in liberal cities like New York, L.A., and Chicago, so my amendment is simple.

Since the spending patterns of military personnel, individuals in rural areas, and farm households are not included in the CPI, they must be taken into account separately in this report.

These are the individuals who produce the food on our kitchen tables, the ones who raise their right hand and swear to defend our Nation. They deserve to be represented, to be heard. My amendment ensures that they are.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, actually, I have a question because it strikes me

as a very sincerely and decently motivated amendment to a flawed bill.

But is there a reason to think that any of the current economic analyses of inflation and the current indicators that we use don't take into account the various factors that the gentleman specifies?

I yield to the gentleman for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, yes, because the definition itself describes that it is only urban and, therefore, not considering the issues, because I can guarantee you that the price and the situation that occurs in people's lives and the cost of living is completely different from one area to the other.

We are just saying that this should be taken into consideration, as well.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time.

That makes great sense to me, and I am tempted to support the amendment. If the gentleman is correct, that points to a larger problem.

Is the gentleman telling us that the inflation rate today that is published by our government does not incorporate spending patterns in rural areas, for example?

□ 1800

Mr. BOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. It is my understanding, by the definition, that would be the case, that everyone should be considered. By this definition, it is not everyone that is considered, only urban.

Mr. RASKIN. I am sorry. By which definition?

Mr. BOST. By the definition that the Consumer Price Index is defined as the average change, over time, in prices paid by urban customers, not by all customers, which would include the people I was talking about, urban only.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, I don't know what the reason for that is, and thank you for educating me. I wasn't aware of it.

I assume they are saying the inflation rate is higher in urban areas than it is in rural areas, which is, presumably, why they peg it to that. That might bring the inflation rate down.

Would the gentleman just give me a sense of how taking it into account might affect what is today the general inflation rate? Let's assume it is inflated because it is focused on the urban areas where the cost of living is higher. Would it reduce the overall inflation rate?

Mr. BOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. Let me explain it this way. The answer is, I don't know, nor do you, nor does anyone because we only use the urban. Therefore, the best thing we could do is include all.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, this very constructive colloquy, I

think, underscores the importance of actually having hearings in Congress. This is legislation that sprung out of someone's head somewhere and then appeared on the House floor without actually having a hearing where we could examine it.

The gentleman raises a profound point that might lead us to question inflation statistics generally. I just don't know. At this point, we are all guessing because we haven't had a hearing, and we don't know the facts of it.

Unfortunately, we are going to be sending people, including me, to the floor to vote on this amendment without really having any information about the background.

Obviously, we want to make sure that military personnel, farm households, and residents of rural areas are included, forcefully, if they are excluded now, even if that means bringing the inflation rate down, something I imagine President Biden would quite enjoy.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment, which makes an important improvement to the bill.

The sky-high inflation America is experiencing under the Biden administration hits hard military families, rural areas, and farm households. Too often, these vital groups of our constituents get short shrift in Washington's policy considerations.

My friend's amendment makes sure that will not happen when it comes to the inflation impact assessments this bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I appreciate the input from everybody involved, and I ask for positive consideration.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after "House of Representatives", insert "the Committee on Homeland

Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives".

Page 3, line 10, after "budgetary", insert "or economic".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is a manager's amendment to enhance in two ways this already very good bill.

First, my amendment expands the bill's coverage. Instead of just covering executive orders with more than \$1 billion in annual effect on the Federal budget, it would also cover executive orders with overall economic impact on our Nation's economy of \$1 billion or more.

We should have inflation-impact assessments for executive orders with such significant economic effects. One such order, for example, would surely be Executive Order No. 13992, by which President Biden revoked President Trump's major regulatory reform orders.

As we all know, President Trump's orders contributed massively to the booming economy America had during the last administration. Beyond doubt, their revocation inflicted more than \$1 billion of annual harm on the economy. Their repeal also makes it harder for American companies to produce a host of goods and services. That will raise inflation by making those goods and services scarcer and more costly.

Other good examples are Executive Orders Nos. 13990 and 14008. These are whole-of-government executive orders by President Biden on climate policy. These orders canceled the Keystone pipeline and launched a host of high-cost regulatory actions, particularly affecting energy.

Those executive orders surely contributed to the sky-high energy inflation Americans have experienced under President Biden.

The second way my amendment improves the bill is by requiring the White House's inflation-impact assessments to be reported not just to the House and Senate Budget Committees but also to the House Oversight and Accountability Committee and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. These committees of cross-cutting jurisdiction should receive these annual reports.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, the first thing I want to note about this amendment is that it now expands the definition of a major executive order to include those projected to cause an annual gross budgetary or economic effect of at least \$1 billion, which includes those orders that would have a positive economic effect of \$1 billion or more, thereby just adding a lot more paperwork, a lot more unnecessary bureaucratic entanglement.

The distinguished chair of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, I think, mentioned in passing the Biden administration's attempt to roll back some of the radical deregulatory program of the Trump administration, which undermined regulations favoring automobile safety, train safety, water safety, land safety.

Again, we have what appears to be another clever talking point by the GOP, and the whole country is now up in arms over what took place in East Palestine, Ohio. We see precisely what the human effects and consequences are of their radical, pro-corporate deregulatory agenda, dismantling the rules and regulations that protect public safety and public welfare.

That is really what is going on over there. It is not about having a couple of little analyses stuck onto an executive order every 4, 5, or 6 months. We know exactly what the real economic program is.

This bill is a camouflage, just like this amendment is, and I urge the body to oppose it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after "shall", insert the following: "publish on the public website of the Office of Management and Budget and"

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of Amendment No. 3, which will require inflation-impact assessments to be published on the Office of Management and Budget's website, not just reported to Congress.

This simple, straightforward amendment will ensure that the American people, who bear the brunt of inflation's impacts, will be better informed of the President's inflation-inducing actions.

Without my amendment, the real-life consequences of Joe Biden's spending spree in the White House will not be seen by those impacted most. This will provide transparency for the administration to answer to the American people.

Thanks to Joe Biden's reckless spending agenda, America will spend \$10 trillion more over the next 10 years than we were estimated to spend. While the Federal Government continues to spend trillions of dollars it doesn't have, inflation has hit a 40-year high and our Nation is now mired in a recession.

Instead of addressing these major economic concerns head-on, the Democratic solution to inflation is to keep on spending.

The GOP majority has been empowered to hold the Biden administration accountable and demand transparency by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing American families and small businesses.

This excessive spending has real consequences. American families will pay an \$8,581 inflation tax over the next year.

Currently, 20 million Americans cannot pay their electric bill. We have seen a 4.3 percent decline in real wages since Biden took office. Americans have lost more than \$2 trillion in retirement savings. Gas is nearly \$4 a gallon again.

Americans are paying more for everything because of leftwing extremist policies.

House Republicans are working to reduce inflation by fundamentally changing the way we vote on appropriations bills and putting an end to reckless spending omnibus packages passed on Christmas Eve, without any time to actually read the bills, multi-thousand-page bills spending trillions of dollars, about 24 hours or less to read it.

We are working to cut wasteful spending, get to the bottom of fraudulent payments made by the Federal Government, support American energy production, and oppose tax increases proposed by the Democrats. Economic strength and job growth result from policies that unshackle job creators, allow American ingenuity, and provide certainty.

Madam Chair, I again thank my colleague, the chairwoman of the Republican Conference, ELISE STEFANIK, for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and vote in favor of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I want to just clear up a couple of things.

First, I heard the very distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado mention job creators. I assume she was responding to President Biden since 12 million

new jobs have been created under President Biden, whereas millions of jobs were lost under the prior President, who may be a favorite of the gentlewoman's.

I also wanted to make just a brief semantic point because the gentlewoman was making a grammatical error that I heard some of her colleagues make before. I believe she referred to a "Democrat solution." I heard another Member talk about a "Democrat Member" and a "Democrat plan."

I just wanted to educate our distinguished colleagues that "Democrat" is the noun. When you use it as an adjective, you say the "Democratic Member," or the "Democratic solution," or the "Democratic plan."

I assume it is a good faith grammatical error the first few times, but after people are corrected several times and they continue to say it, it seems like it is an act of incivility, as if every time we mentioned the other party it just came out with a kind of political speech impediment like, "Oh, the banana Republican Party," as if we were to say that every time we mentioned the "banana Republican Member," or the "banana Republican plan," or the "banana Republican Conference," but we wouldn't do that.

□ 1815

So out of pure political courtesy, when it is an adjective, refer to the "Democratic Congresswoman" or the "Democratic Member."

Having said that, I would like to say that I favor the Boebert amendment. I think it is really the Raskin amendment because none of them apparently caught the fact that their reporting requirement wasn't to be published until I told them. I actually read the bill, and I said there is no publication of it. So this amendment follows through on the fact that I pointed out to them that their bill didn't even call for publication of the inflation information which they thought was so essential.

Madam Chair, I am afraid I am going to have to support the Boebert amendment, because I think I am the genesis of it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I do want to take a few seconds to respond. That was great. We are addressed as MAGA extremists, extreme MAGA Republicans. I will just make a clarification point. It is ultra MAGA. That is what we prefer.

But I will say to the ranking member, I am very happy that they have moved on from pronouns to adjectives. When they start acting democratic, I will be sure to call them the Democratic Party.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The REIN IN Act already ensures both the President and Congress receive the inflation impact assessment

the bill requires. My colleague's amendment guarantees another vital recipient gets these assessments, as well: that recipient is the American people, who are bearing the brunt of Bidenflation.

Once the White House assessments are posted on the Office of Management and Budget's website plain as day, as my friend's amendment requires, the American people will be able to know and judge better for themselves how the President is impacting their daily lives.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CLOUD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-4.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, insert after the period the following: "Any statement prepared under this subsection shall incorporate the inflationary impact of the debt servicing costs associated with the applicable major Executive order."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The intent of the REIN IN Act is to ensure that the executive branch is taking into account inflation in our country before they issue new regulations.

Our country has seen rising inflation over the last 2 years, and inflation is affecting all of us. It is affecting our families, especially those with lower incomes who don't have as much of a cushion to deal with what we are seeing as they face increasing costs, especially in gas and in groceries.

But as we consider the cost of inflation, we should also include the cost of debt servicing in what we are doing. Too often, we, as a government, don't do the same thing that we expect our families to do. When someone goes to purchase a car, for example, or a house, they have to include the cost of interest that they are going to pay on those kinds of things. We regularly ignore

that as if it wasn't an important part of what we spend when, in fact, it is about \$600 billion of spending annually.

This is why I offered my amendment to the REIN IN Act. My amendment would amend the bill to direct the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers to incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs into the reports that they create.

Rising interest rates have the same effect on costs of spending on the national result, as well. We see rising interest rates have the same meaning for our country as the families that we encounter. But in order to accurately account for what we are spending, we cannot ignore the cost of debt servicing or the real cost that will be accrued with new spending.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget released a report today that estimated net interest will total \$10.5 trillion over the next decade. As lawmakers, we have a duty to be honest about the effects of our actions, and this amendment will keep us honest about the true effects of our spending.

Madam Chair, I encourage support of my amendment and the underlying legislation as well, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I would ask if the gentleman would be willing to yield for a couple of questions?

Again, there was no hearing in committee, so I don't understand this. This might be a great idea, but I would like to figure it out.

It requires that any inflationary estimates prepared incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs, which seems perfectly logical to me.

But is there a reason to think that the current inflation rate, as defined by the U.S. Government, does not incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs?

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, yes, it has been regular practice with CBO. I have been working to get this done for the CBO as well since I got here in Congress.

It is the common practice among all of the entities that we look to for wisdom and advice and guidance on budgeting and spending, that the cost of debt servicing is not counted into their projections.

Mr. RASKIN. So that is true across the board in terms of all of the economic indicators that we read about, whether it is the OMB or the—

Mr. CLOUD. The information that we get to take into account, like when we are evaluating a bill and what we think the 10-year projected cost is, yes, typically it does not include the debt servicing cost.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time and thank the gentleman for his kind answers.

This really is why we have hearings in Congress, because it feels like we are just posting a lot of graffiti on a wall here.

I don't know how the inflation rate is calculated. I don't know whether the import of this amendment would be to double count debt servicing costs because I don't know which government agencies actually incorporate debt servicing costs and which don't.

One thing I do know is that if the gentleman has the greatest amendment of the year, it is still basically irrelevant because it does nothing. In other words, it is not going to do anything to bring down anybody's debt servicing costs, which I agree are huge, unlike, for example, what the Biden administration has done in terms of student debt by acting dramatically to bring it down—even though there are people from across the aisle who are in court today, I believe, trying to get that thrown out and trying to bring everybody's student loan debt back up—that is real economic action.

In any event, what this is about is pure symbolism. In other words, they are asking for a reporting bill that will only apply if there is a \$1 billion plus impact, and the good gentleman comes forward to say: Make sure, Mr. President, when you are doing your calculations, that you include debt servicing costs.

I don't know. You could take it or leave it. It doesn't do anything for people who are staggering under debt. The way that the Biden administration is trying to act, for example, is to deal with the problem of student debt or the way that we have acted to try to help people who are suffering under mortgage debt, that is real economic action.

I am just going to have to consider it carefully, given the information we have. But I will end with a plea for the good chairman of the Oversight Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky: We have to have hearings on these bills, so we know what we are talking about, because I feel like we are dancing in the dark here.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I once again point out that we spend approximately \$600 billion a year in interest payments, yet we do not count the cost of what the debt servicing will cost in anything we do.

Now, that is, in short order, expected to eclipse our military spending, which is our number one constitutional priority for our Federal spending. Whatever we want to do up here, if we do not begin to count the real cost of what we are doing, we will be off. Right now, we are having to deal with a debt ceiling issue, because the previous Congress decided to spend without considering the cost of what it was going to take and to push us toward the limit.

We are cognizant of the fact that we are spending. We are going to monitor our spending in a way that we leave a

better country for our kids and our grandkids, and this is part of making sure that we are actually counting the real cost of what we are doing as we take each step.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), the distinguished chair of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

Often when inflation is considered, people fail to consider one of its important effects. That effect is on how much more it costs taxpayers to pay interest on our Federal debt. Those interest payments are high, and they spike higher when interest rates rise.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Federal Government would pay \$400 billion in interest on the Federal debt during fiscal year 2022. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget projected at the time that for every 1 percent increase in interest rates, those annual payments would rise by \$38 billion. Remember, that was for fiscal year 2022, when the Federal debt and interest rates were lower than they are now.

My colleague's amendment makes sure the impact on the Federal debt service costs will not be overlooked in the inflation impact assessments the bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I just repeat my puzzlement from before.

Perhaps if Mr. CLOUD would yield for another question.

What is the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs? Have there been any economic studies on that?

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman for a colloquy.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, what we are trying to do is make sure that the debt servicing cost is included into these studies we are getting.

I have a bill, for example, to eventually do it with the Congressional Budget Office. We would like to see that, as well. This would make sure that we are getting this done in the REIN IN Act with the OMB and the Council of Economic Advisers.

It is common sense to me. This should be bipartisan. We should really be counting the costs of what we are actually spending. This isn't really meant to be a controversial bill, except for those who don't really want to know what we are actually spending.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time.

I think the gentleman raises a very interesting point. I would love to know the answer as to whether or not it is actually incorporated today in what the inflationary or deflationary effects are of debt servicing costs. Obviously, this bill and this amendment would not have any impact on what those debt servicing costs are, but I don't see much of a problem of adding this language to the hortatory nature of the legislation.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just add, it may not change what we are doing, but it would change the knowledge of what we are doing here in Congress. The fact that we continue to spend money without even knowing how much money we are spending, I think, is a problem and certainly not the due diligence that we should have as Members of Congress, being diligent with the public trust that we have been given.

So having the real cost estimates before us is going to be very valuable as we go forward to understand exactly what we are doing as we begin to evaluate legislation and for the administration when they are dealing with regulations they are proposing.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I will just end on this one with this thought.

The majority comes forward with a plan to say we want to know an estimated inflationary impact of an executive order, and then we have a series of Christmas tree amendments saying, make sure you include the cost to rural areas; make sure you include the cost of debt servicing. I would like to know the overall costs.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1830

The CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike "inflation," and insert "inflation or".

Page 2, beginning on line 11, strike the comma and all that follows through "prepared" on line 14.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, for those of us who have had the privilege of serving in the United States Congress for a period of time, going through any number of Speakers and majorities, what we are doing this evening in the midst of the needs of the American people is *deja vu*.

Let me say that the Congressional Review Act process, which we debated

just a few hours ago, would have added a 60-day review period on crucial, life-saving executive orders that would have been necessary or have been necessary to save lives and to improve the quality of life of the American people—in this instance, rulemaking.

It is obstructionist. It was passed, the Congressional Review Act—obstruction—some 60-day review period, adding a Senate vote, a House vote, a veto, and coming back again when American lives are in jeopardy for healthcare, for the environment, for labor laws, any number of things, for criminal justice reform, any number of rules that would create a better pathway for Americans.

Now, we come with the REIN IN Act. I am positive that we did the REIN IN Act some years ago. It sounds very familiar. This one deals with allegedly providing some pathway for dealing effectively with inflation.

I would hope my colleagues would be as interested in raising the debt ceiling, which will stop the bleeding of the American people and busting their wallets open because we have refused to pay our bills.

This seems to ignore the work that President Biden has done to cut everyday costs for working families, bring global supply chains back in, alleviating debt for students and veterans, and fighting climate change.

This part of their larger plan to cut Medicare, Social Security, and other crucial programs are in this bill.

Eliminating the language that we did with my amendment further helps to ensure that improper and ambiguous congressional interference in executive orders as sought through this legislation is appropriately curtailed.

The executive orders that are well vetted by the President of the United States that have helped populations that have been in trouble, that have brought about a reckoning of police reform, these executive orders would not be interfered with under the pretense of trying to suggest an inflationary impact.

Why not applaud the work that President Biden has done, as I said, with alleviating the debt of students and veterans, of which there are those now fighting this in the Supreme Court, the work he has done on climate change, and the work we have all done—Democrats and the President—to preserve Medicare, Social Security, and other critical programs?

I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 6 to stop the interference that has no benefit and impact on any inflationary uptick. What we need to do is work together to provide a budget, to be able to overview the budget, and to be able to come together to raise the debt ceiling to pay America's bills.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support amendment No. 6, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, the amendment strikes the bill's requirement for an inflation impact assessment when an executive order will have a significant impact on inflation, but the impact cannot yet be precisely quantified.

That is exactly the wrong approach to take. If the White House can determine an executive order will indeed have a significant impact on inflation, that is what is important. The President should know about that before he acts.

It would be unwise and dangerous to happily let the President proceed in the dark about an order's inflationary impacts just because they cannot be calculated with perfect precision.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, this is *deja vu*. I know the intent of this legislation, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

What I would say is my amendment clearly wants to take away destructive interference in the work that the executive has to do through vetting their executive orders by not insisting on extra baggage that would not in any way provide any relief to inflation.

What will provide relief to inflation would be to ensure that the debt of students is reduced, that veterans are protected, that Medicare and Social Security are protected, and that the debt ceiling is raised.

My amendment, by eliminating the language, further helps to ensure that improper and ambiguous congressional interference with executive orders, as sought through this legislation, is appropriately curtailed because the more you delay constructive executive orders to help the American people, the more you undermine the relief of the American people and help to bring down inflation.

Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation or REIN In Act, an unnecessary, ambiguous and improper reporting bill that undermines the important steps President Biden has taken to cut everyday costs for working families.

H.R. 347 would require the Administration to publish the inflationary impact of executive orders that are projected to have an annual budgetary effect of at least \$1 billion.

While I stand in strong opposition to this measure, I have offered five amendments, four of which were made in order, to H.R. 347 in order to help address the some of ambiguity and unnecessary oversight of presidential executive orders this bill unfortunately puts forth.

Jackson Lee Amendment #5 restricts the bill to only cover Executive Orders as listed in Sec. 2 (d)(2)(A) (emergency assistance) and (B) (national security or treaties).

The Jackson Lee Amendment #5 would change the legislation to make only those executive orders that qualify as emergency assistance and national security or treaties to go through mandatory inflation forecasting, instead of requiring that all executive orders outside of the scope of emergency assistance or national security or treaties go through mandatory inflation forecasts.

Jackson Lee Amendment #6 inserts into Sec. 2 (a) line 10 "or" after "inflation" and Strikes Sec. (a) lines 11–14, to clarify and make consistent with economic policy on inflationary impacts and effects.

Jackson Lee Amendment #6 would eliminate some of the ambiguous and extraneous language in this bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment #7 adds at the end of section 2(d) the definition to "significant impact" in Sec. 2 (a), which states as follows: "The term 'significant impact on inflation' means an Executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year."

Jackson Lee Amendment #7 would define significant impact in regard to the increase or decrease of the Consumer Price Index.

It is important that Significant Impact to the Consumer Price Index of inflation is specified to eliminate ambiguity in the application of the term "significant".

In keeping in line with nationally recognized standards for what is deemed to be "significant" in the context of inflation, many economists agree that an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year is considered to be a significant impact on the Consumer Price Index over a year.

Jackson Lee Amendment #8 adds at the end of section 2(d), (4) "The term 'quantifiable inflationary impact' means an Executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year."

The Jackson Lee Amendment #8 would specify the meaning and application of what quantifiable inflationary impact is to eliminate ambiguity and uncertainty in its contextual use for the purpose of this legislation.

And so again, keeping in line with nationally recognized standards, many economists agree that a "quantifiable inflationary impact" is deemed to occur when there is an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year.

While H.R. 347 is a clear overreach and would impose improper and onerous restrictions upon the Executive Branch, the Jackson Lee Amendments will be offered to this body as mere attempted to help ensure that the inappropriate limitations as proscribed by this legislation are curtailed in its effort to limit the authority of the Executive orders.

The ability of the Executive Branch to carry out its Executive Orders without improper or overbearing congressional restrictions on such actions is of utmost importance to our Democracy and the continued growth and betterment of our country.

And while executive orders are not expressly addressed in the U.S. Constitution and no statute grants the President the general power to issue them, executive orders have always been accepted as an inherent and necessary aspect of presidential power and function of our government since its inception.

The legislation, however, oversteps the boundaries of our nation's governmental functions by attempting to override critically important and vital actions our democracy needs and has historically accepted as an inherent facet of separate functioning branches of our government.

Imposing such broad and ambiguous oversight of executive orders as proposed by H.R. 347 would only serve as an unnecessary and improper restriction on the powers of the Presidential executive orders, while also perpetuating a waste of government resources and further hindering American economic growth.

As such, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this onerous and unnecessary bill.

Madam Chair, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I request a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2(d), add the following:

(4) SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term "significant impact" means, with respect to a major Executive order, that such order is estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, we cannot run the government by ambiguity, confusion, lack of clarity, and just throwing language down on the floor and expecting all the pieces of government to work together.

I question whether this legislation and the legislation dealing with the Congressional Review Act is ever going to be passed in the United States Senate. I question that. It would have been nice to have hearings and work together.

This amendment tries to bring clarity. My amendment tries to define the term "significant impact." The term "significant impact on inflation" means an executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least

1 percentage point over the course of a year. This amendment does clarify that the meaning of “significant impact on inflation” is quantifiable in any effort to make such a determination.

The lack of specificity of applicability for when this unnecessary legislative restriction would take place, and mandate, will be imposed on all executive orders, as provided for in the bill, is unnecessary, time-consuming, and a waste of resources. In fact, I don’t even know how any President would get through it.

I am not saying that executive orders should not have their necessary oversight. They can. The Oversight and Accountability Committee and other jurisdictional committees can have oversight.

If this is to reduce inflation, all this bill will do is raise the costs of any act or action that is asked for in the executive order.

Jackson Lee amendment No. 7 would help to ensure that any attempt to restrict the powers and authority of executive orders is curtailed in a manner that would limit such mandate to apply only in such scenario whereby economically accepted standards are considered and applied.

For example, “significant impact on inflation” is limited to instances where there has been an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index, the CPI, inflation by at least 1 percent over the course of a year. With that in mind, we would have clarity; we would have an understanding; and we would be able to know whether this is irrelevant, burdensome, and overly excessive in doing the work on behalf of the American people.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, this amendment defines a “significant impact on inflation” as only an impact that would increase or decrease the Consumer Price Index by at least 1 percentage point.

With all due respect, that is magical thinking. If a single executive order were to produce a full 1 percentage point increase in inflation, that would not be just a significant effect; it would be a massive effect.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics’ inflation data from January 23, 2023, showed that the Consumer Price Index rose 6.4 percent over the prior year. A 1 percent point rise would constitute 16 percent of that yearly rise. That is a huge portion of yearly inflation.

Few individual executive orders, even ones that stoke inflation significantly, would on their own raise inflation by 1 full percentage point or more.

What the amendment really is trying to do is gut the bill.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. LEE of Florida). The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I want to speak in strong support of the gentlewoman’s amendment. I thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her leadership in terms of real economic policy, which is about making the government an instrument of well-being and public good.

We know we have serious philosophical differences with our friends across the aisle. Many of them wanted to dismantle Social Security and Medicare. When President Biden arrived the other day, a lot of them retreated very quickly from it.

I would be delighted if someone wants to challenge me on that because we have all the quotations from all the Republican Senators and Representatives that said it was time to get rid of Social Security and phase it out, adopt means testing, increase the age, so on and so forth.

That is a real policy difference. What they have done here really falls under the category of symbolic politics. The good gentlewoman from Texas has done her best to make this meaningful, and I thank her for giving me the opportunity to say that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for further clarifying our intent.

Usually, inflation, by the economists, is around 2 percent. To have this amendment that indicates 1 percent, it gives some clarity of a significant impact.

I would say this: I believe in oversight, but I don’t believe in obstruction, intrusion, and stopping work that impacts the American people.

My amendment provides clarity so that the work for the American people can go forward. It is evident that President Biden has had a significant impact on bringing down inflation and building a better quality of life.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 7, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2(d), add the following:

(4) QUANTIFIABLE INFLATIONARY IMPACT.—The term “quantifiable inflationary impact” means, with respect to a major Executive order, that such order is estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, all of us have seen the great work of the Oversight and Reform Committee in the two initiatives that we have had today.

Clearly, we are all sort of stretching to try to understand the impact of the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, and we are trying to find the substance.

So my previous amendment was dealing with significant impact, and now we are dealing with quantifiable inflationary impact. I wanted to add as to what this actually means.

So my amendment says quantifiable inflationary impact means an executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year knowing that inflation is usually 2 percent a year.

I am just trying to find light in darkness and to try to understand what this bill is doing and to give those who are in government to do good, those who are trying to solve problems with a legitimate executive order to have some guidance that relates to inflation and not be of no substance with a bottomless pit, to be very honest with you, Madam Chair.

I am hoping my colleagues will join me in trying to give some guidance and some quantifiable definition to quantifiable inflationary input by tracking it to what has traditionally been by economists inflation 2 percent. We just went to 1 percent to give some definition to this to give some ability for anyone to understand how to analyze or utilize this legislation if it ever gets to the President’s desk.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, this amendment is similar to my colleague's last amendment. It defines a "quantifiable inflationary impact" as only an impact that would increase or decrease the Consumer Price Index by at least 1 percentage point.

If a given executive order did not have that level of impact, the bill, if amended this way, would require no inflation impact assessment.

But as my colleague's prior amendment, this amendment would not improve the bill, but instead gut the bill.

Letting off the hook all executive orders with less than 1 percentage point impact on the Consumer Price Index would mean that all or virtually all orders would be off the hook. That includes those with obviously significant inflationary effects.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Chair, let me quickly say that, again, the Jackson Lee amendment before us is keeping in line with nationally recognized standards.

Many economists agree that a quantifiable inflationary impact is deemed to occur when there is an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percent and over the course of a year. It will not gut the bill. It will let us try to understand the bill.

While H.R. 347 is a clear overreach and would impose improper and onerous restrictions upon the executive branch, the Jackson Lee amendment tries to find some common ground that will be offered to this body as a mere attempt to help ensure that the inappropriate limitations as prescribed by this legislation are curtailed in its effort to limit the authority of the executive orders.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to consider and vote for the Jackson Lee amendment No. 8, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, add the following:

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to suggest that the task of combating inflation and bringing down the cost of living is the sole

responsibility of the Executive Office of the President, and not also a key pursuit of the United States House of Representatives during the 118th Congress through thoughtful, productive legislative action.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

My amendment underscores the fact that it is not the sole responsibility of the executive office of the President to reduce inflation, but that productive, bipartisan legislative action is the best way that we can collectively combat inflation and bring down the cost of living.

I represent southern Nevada, a part of the country that has been especially hit hard by the price hikes driven up by the pandemic, supply chain disruptions, and Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

Nevadan families have been hurting. They have been forced to make difficult decisions about how to make ends meet and how to provide for their loved ones for far too long, and they are tired of finger-pointing. They are done with partisan potshots and bickering that achieve nothing to help them make ends meet.

Although the pace of inflation has slowed since hitting a peak last summer, the cost of living continues to remain far too high, and that is why they and the rest of America are calling on Congress for us to do our job, to take real action, and to provide relief. That is what we owe them.

We made progress in this direction during the last Congress with the CHIPS and Science Act, the bipartisan infrastructure package, and other landmark bills that continue to help strengthen our supply chains and relieve price pressures.

This Congress we need to continue that legacy and set aside political posturing and instead advance more thoughtful legislation that will actually bring down costs and meet the needs of our constituents.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: Congress is at our best when we put policy first and politics last.

I implore all of my colleagues to support this amendment because finding bipartisan compromise and real progress on our Nation's most pressing issue is not only right, it is what we were sent here to do.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of Mrs. LEE's excellent amendment here which makes both powerful economic points and powerful constitutional points.

The economic point is that Congress must act in order to bring down infla-

tion, Congress must act in order to promote employment, and we have acted in partnership with President Biden to do just that in the Inflation Reduction Act, in the infrastructure act, and in a whole series of bills that we have used to bring inflation down and to dramatically lower unemployment in the country.

But she is making also, I believe, a very powerful constitutional point because part of what gets lost in the symbolism of this legislation—a mere messaging bill about having executive orders over \$1 billion, which describes a handful in a year attached in an inflation description—what gets lost is that the Constitution in Article I sets it up so that Congress is the major definer of economic policy in the country.

It is Congress that is supposed to be laying and collecting taxes and impost and dealing with the debt of the country. It is Congress that regulates commerce among the States and with foreign countries.

So the failure to come forward with real productive legislation on inflation is also a surrender to the executive branch, and we don't need to do that.

So we should be working with the executive branch as we have done in the Inflation Reduction Act, with the infrastructure bill, in lowering prescription drug costs, and in lowering the costs for diabetics to get their insulin shots to \$35 a month. That is the real pathway, not just a bunch of reporting bills.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, my colleague's amendment states an obvious fact: It is the responsibility of both the President and the House of Representatives to combat inflation. I have no quarrel with that.

In fact, in advancing this bill, the House is taking one step toward fulfilling its responsibility to combat inflation.

It is doing so by using this legislative authority to help ensure that the President focuses on combating inflation, not issuing executive orders that make inflation worse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR.
LANGWORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, as the designee of Mr. ANDY OGLES, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after "consumer" insert "or producer".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague's amendment makes sure that inflation assessments prepared under the bill will address a critical inflationary measure—the Producer Price Index.

Now, when people think of inflation, they usually think of the Consumer Price Index. But the Producer Price Index is critical as well. It measures changes in the selling prices domestic producers receive for their output. These prices are from the very first commercial transactions for many products and services. Thus, changes in the Producer Price Index can signal that changes in prices are about to ripple through the economy.

These should be accounted for in each inflation impact assessment that the bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. As far as I understand, the amendment just adds one more unnecessary detail to the report, creating greater administrative burden and taxpayer costs that are still undefined. It is unclear why it is necessary. If it is necessary, it should be adopted across the board. But, of course, we had no hearing so we can't really understand what the merits of the proposal are, but right now, it just seems like a lot more bureaucratic paperwork.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida) having assumed the chair, Ms. LEE of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENHANCED SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAINS CARRYING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

(Mr. DELUZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the fact that when Norfolk Southern's train derailed next to my district—leaking chemicals, evacuating constituents, and distressing thousands—the people of western Pennsylvania were mad, and so was I.

That is why my first bill in Congress is to take on the railroads. Today, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and I introduced the DERAILED Act, which ensures trains carrying hazardous materials are properly classified and have increased safety requirements. It is long overdue, but rail industry lobbyists have fought against it.

This derailment included hazardous materials, but since the train wasn't classified properly, it didn't have stricter safety rules. That is why we need the DERAILED Act.

This bill is for everyone in Beaver County, East Palestine. It is for everyone who has heard about this derailment and thought: "Could this happen here?" The terrible reality is yes, it could, but if colleagues from both parties join together, it doesn't have to.

Let's tell the railroads we won't let them recklessly pursue profit and endanger our communities and workers.

I will keep fighting to hold Norfolk Southern accountable for every penny of pain they have caused.

BUILDING A MORE EQUITABLE ECONOMY FOR ALL

(Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the last day of Black History Month to celebrate the remarkable contributions of Black businessowners.

Business ownership leads to higher incomes and more wealth, but decades of systemic bias, redlining, lending discrimination, and inequity in wages have created an ever-widening wealth gap for minority communities.

According to the Alliance for Entrepreneurial Equity, Black-owned businesses are three to five times more likely to be labeled as a high credit risk, which sets up barriers to affordable financing and slows growth. During the height of the pandemic, minority-owned firms were more likely to be completely shut out of credit and capital resources, receiving none of the financing they sought out.

This Black History Month, I met with entrepreneurs in my district who drive our economy forward, people like Malik Muhammad, owner of an independent bookstore in Baldwin Hills. Malik is passionate about investing in the community and does so by hosting bookfairs at local schools because he knows that in order for his neighborhood to thrive, more people of color need to start businesses in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to recognize the great strength that is Black entrepreneurship and work with me to build a more equitable economy for all.

CONGRATULATING JOANNA MCCLINTON

(Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you proud—proud of Pennsylvania; proud of my Democratic colleagues in the Pennsylvania House; proud of the thousands of volunteers who helped deliver a statehouse majority last November in Pennsylvania, a house majority that on this last day of Black History Month is celebrating history—or should I say her-story—Pennsylvania made today.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and celebrate Representative Joanna McClinton, my colleague, my friend, and, as of today, speaker of the Pennsylvania House, the first woman, the first African-American woman, to be called Madam Speaker.

Speaker McClinton follows in the footsteps of men like Leroy Irvis, the first African-American speaker of the Pennsylvania House, and African-American trailblazers like Barbara Jordan and Karen Bass.

What a crucial time in our State's history, our Nation's history, to have Speaker McClinton lead us, a time when we can fairly fund our education, rebuild roads, and combat gun violence and the opioid epidemic while protecting the planet for our children and children to come.

Joanna, a mother, a minister, a former public defender, now our speaker, what a way to end Black History Month. Congratulations to the Pennsylvania House. Congratulations, and Godspeed, Speaker McClinton.